

HSY/vm1 7/21/2016



**FILED**  
7-21-16  
04:59 PM

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the Matter of the Application of Southern California Edison Company (U338E) for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for the RTRP Transmission Project.

Application 15-04-013  
(Filed April 15, 2015)

**E-MAIL RULING GRANTING CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM  
OPERATORS MOTION FOR PARTY STATUS**

Dated July 21, 2016, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ HALLIE YACKNIN

Hallie Yacknin  
Administrative Law Judge

A.15-04-013 HSY/vm1

**From:** Yacknin, Hallie

**Sent:** Thursday, July 21, 2016 1:56 PM

**To:** Stephen D. Lee; tkim@rwglaw.com; ian.forrest@sce.com; Penny.n@ccaej.org; abeaumon@riversideca.gov; krazi@strathamhomes.com; DCosgrove@Rutan.com; dcosgrove@rutan.com; ssherlock@swlaw.com; Charles.Krolikowski@ndlf.com; Obiora, Noel; mmattes@nossaman.com; slee@rwglaw.com; ggiovinco@rwglaw.com; LPomatto@rwglaw.com; pthorson@rwglaw.com; case.admin@sce.com; Liddell@EnergyAttorney.com; jeff.clemens@lennar.com; cem@newsdata.com; alexeyorkin@flynnrci.com; brflynn@flynnrci.com; pushkarwagle@flynnrci.com; Blaising@Braunlegal.com; abb@eslawfirm.com; Mee, Charles; Mee, Charles; Yacknin, Hallie; Uchida, Jensen; Abhulimen, Joseph A.; Peterson, Rachel A.

**Cc:** ALJ Docket Office; ALJ\_Support ID; ALJ Process

**Subject:** A.15-04-013 -- email ruling granting CAISO motion for party status

Thank you Mr. Lee.

I hereby grant the California Independent System Operator's motion for party status in this matter.

Accordingly, the City of Jurupa Valley may reply to both SCE's and the CAISO's responses to its motion to dismiss.

Docket Office shall formally file this ruling.

Hallie Yacknin  
Administrative Law Judge  
415.703.1675

*ALJ Division Vision: Just, reasoned, efficient, and innovative resolution of matters in a manner that ensures integrity, due process and transparency, and respects the dignity of all participants.*

**From:** Stephen D. Lee [<mailto:SLee@rwglaw.com>]

**Sent:** Thursday, July 21, 2016 1:49 PM

**To:** Yacknin, Hallie

**Cc:** B. Tilden Kim

**Subject:** FW: (External):RE: A.15-04-013 -- Meet and Confer Regarding CAISO's Motion for Party Status

Dear Judge Yacknin,

Pursuant to your invitation, I have met and conferred with the parties to this proceeding regarding whether any party intends to oppose CAISO's motion for party status. I requested that parties respond by noon today, and thus far no parties have indicated that they intend to oppose CAISO's motion for party status.

Attached below is SCE's response, indicating it will not oppose CAISO's motion. In addition, Lennar Homes of California, Inc. does not oppose CAISO's motion for party status. Speaking on behalf of the City of Jurupa Valley, the City also does not oppose CAISO's motion.

I therefore respectfully request a ruling on CAISO's motion; that the City of Jurupa Valley be permitted to file a single reply brief to both SCE's and CAISO's responses; and that the City's combined reply be due on July 29, 2016.

Best,  
Stephen Lee

Richards | Watson | Gershon  
355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3101  
T 213.626.8484 | F 213.626.0078  
[slee@rwglaw.com](mailto:slee@rwglaw.com)

**From:** Ian Forrest [<mailto:Ian.Forrest@sce.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, July 20, 2016 5:00 PM

**To:** Stephen D. Lee; B. Tilden Kim; B. Tilden Kim; [Penny.n@ccaej.org](mailto:Penny.n@ccaej.org); [abeaumon@riversideca.gov](mailto:abeaumon@riversideca.gov); [krazi@strathamhomes.com](mailto:krazi@strathamhomes.com); [DCosgrove@Rutan.com](mailto:DCosgrove@Rutan.com); [dcosgrove@rutan.com](mailto:dcosgrove@rutan.com); [ssherlock@swlaw.com](mailto:ssherlock@swlaw.com); [Charles.Krolikowski@ndlf.com](mailto:Charles.Krolikowski@ndlf.com); Obiora, Noel; mmattes (nossaman.com); Ginetta Giovinco; Linda Pomatto; Peter M. Thorson; Case Admin; [Liddell@EnergyAttorney.com](mailto:Liddell@EnergyAttorney.com); [jeff.clemens@lennar.com](mailto:jeff.clemens@lennar.com); [cem@newsdata.com](mailto:cem@newsdata.com); [alexeyorkin@flynnrci.com](mailto:alexeyorkin@flynnrci.com); [brflynn@flynnrci.com](mailto:brflynn@flynnrci.com); [pushkarwagle@flynnrci.com](mailto:pushkarwagle@flynnrci.com); [Blaising@Braunlegal.com](mailto:Blaising@Braunlegal.com); [abb@eslawfirm.com](mailto:abb@eslawfirm.com)

**Subject:** RE: (External):RE: A.15-04-013 -- Meet and Confer Regarding CAISO's Motion for Party Status

Stephen,

SCE supports CAISO's involvement in the RTRP proceeding and does not intend to oppose their motion for party status.

Thank you,  
Ian

**Ian Michael Forrest**, Senior Attorney  
Real Property, Local Government Affairs & Licensing  
Law Department, 376 A  
Southern California Edison Company  
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue  
Rosemead, California 91770  
Tel. (626) 302-6980  
Fax. (626) 302-1926  
Cell. (626) 800-8770  
[ian.forrest@sce.com](mailto:ian.forrest@sce.com)

---

NOTICE: This e-mail message and all attachments may contain legally privileged and confidential information intended solely for the use of the addressee. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you may not read, copy, distribute or otherwise use this message or its attachments. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender by email and delete all copies of the message immediately.

**From:** Stephen D. Lee [<mailto:SLee@rwglaw.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 20, 2016 10:45 AM  
**To:** tkim (rwglaw.com) <[tkim@rwglaw.com](mailto:tkim@rwglaw.com)>; tkim (rwglaw.com) <[tkim@rwglaw.com](mailto:tkim@rwglaw.com)>; Ian Forrest <[Ian.Forrest@sce.com](mailto:Ian.Forrest@sce.com)>; Penny.n@ccaej.org; [abeaumon@riversideca.gov](mailto:abeaumon@riversideca.gov); [krazi@strathamhomes.com](mailto:krazi@strathamhomes.com); [DCosgrove@Rutan.com](mailto:DCosgrove@Rutan.com); [dcosgrove@rutan.com](mailto:dcosgrove@rutan.com); [ssherlock@swlaw.com](mailto:ssherlock@swlaw.com); [Charles.Krolikowski@ndlf.com](mailto:Charles.Krolikowski@ndlf.com); Obiora, Noel <[noel.obiora@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:noel.obiora@cpuc.ca.gov)>; mmattes (nossaman.com) <[mmattes@nossaman.com](mailto:mmattes@nossaman.com)>; Ginetta Giovinco <[GGiovinco@rwglaw.com](mailto:GGiovinco@rwglaw.com)>; Linda Pomatto <[LPomatto@rwglaw.com](mailto:LPomatto@rwglaw.com)>; Peter M. Thorson <[PTThorson@rwglaw.com](mailto:PTThorson@rwglaw.com)>; Case Admin <[Case.Admin@sce.com](mailto:Case.Admin@sce.com)>; [Liddell@EnergyAttorney.com](mailto:Liddell@EnergyAttorney.com); [jeff.clemens@lennar.com](mailto:jeff.clemens@lennar.com); [cem@newsdata.com](mailto:cem@newsdata.com); [alexeyorkin@flynnrci.com](mailto:alexeyorkin@flynnrci.com); [brflynn@flynnrci.com](mailto:brflynn@flynnrci.com); [pushkarwagle@flynnrci.com](mailto:pushkarwagle@flynnrci.com); [Blaising@Braunlegal.com](mailto:Blaising@Braunlegal.com); [abb@eslawfirm.com](mailto:abb@eslawfirm.com)  
**Subject:** (External):RE: A.15-04-013 -- Meet and Confer Regarding CAISO's Motion for Party Status

Counsel,

Pursuant to Judge Yacknin's invitation below, I am writing to meet and confer with the parties to this proceeding regarding whether any party intends to oppose CAISO's motion for party status. Please let me know of your response by

noon on Thursday July 21, 2016 so that I may report back to Judge Yacknin according to her instruction.

Best,  
Stephen Lee

Richards | Watson | Gershon  
355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3101  
T 213.626.8484 | F 213.626.0078  
[slee@rwglaw.com](mailto:slee@rwglaw.com)

**From:** Yacknin, Hallie [<mailto:hallie.yacknin@cpuc.ca.gov>]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 18, 2016 10:55 AM  
**To:** Stephen D. Lee  
**Cc:** B. Tilden Kim; B. Tilden Kim; [ian.forrest@sce.com](mailto:ian.forrest@sce.com); [Penney.n@ccaej.org](mailto:Penney.n@ccaej.org); [abeaumon@riversideca.gov](mailto:abeaumon@riversideca.gov); [krazi@strathamhomes.com](mailto:krazi@strathamhomes.com); [DCosgrove@Rutan.com](mailto:DCosgrove@Rutan.com); [dcosgrove@rutan.com](mailto:dcosgrove@rutan.com); [ssherlock@swlaw.com](mailto:ssherlock@swlaw.com); [Charles.Krolkowski@ndlf.com](mailto:Charles.Krolkowski@ndlf.com); Obiora, Noel; [mmattes@nossaman.com](mailto:mmattes@nossaman.com); Stephen D. Lee; Ginetta Giovinco; Linda Pomatto; Peter M. Thorson; [case.admin@sce.com](mailto:case.admin@sce.com); [Liddell@EnergyAttorney.com](mailto:Liddell@EnergyAttorney.com); [jeff.clemens@lennar.com](mailto:jeff.clemens@lennar.com); [cem@newsdata.com](mailto:cem@newsdata.com); [alexeyorkin@flynnrci.com](mailto:alexeyorkin@flynnrci.com); [brflynn@flynnrci.com](mailto:brflynn@flynnrci.com); [pushkarwagle@flynnrci.com](mailto:pushkarwagle@flynnrci.com); [Blaising@Braunlegal.com](mailto:Blaising@Braunlegal.com); [abb@eslawfirm.com](mailto:abb@eslawfirm.com); Mee, Charles; Mee, Charles; Yacknin, Hallie; Uchida, Jensen; Abhulimen, Joseph A.; Peterson, Rachel A.  
**Subject:** RE: A.15-04-013 -- Request to File Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss

Mr. Lee –

Your request to file a reply to SCE's response to your motion is granted. (Be sure to so indicate in the opening paragraph, per Rule 11.1(f).)

I cannot allow you to file a reply to CAISO's response until I rule on its motion for party status. I will rule on that motion only after either (1) the time for filing an opposition to the CAISO's motion has passed, or (2) I am informed that none of the parties will be opposing the motion.

If you would prefer to file a single reply to the SCE and CAISO, then I invite you to meet and confer with the parties to the proceeding, and to report back to me if none intend to oppose the CAISO's motion for party status, and I will quickly rule.

Otherwise, you may move to file a separate reply to the CAISO if I grant the motion after the time for filing oppositions to it has passed.

Hallie Yacknin  
Administrative Law Judge  
415.703.1675

*ALJ Division Vision: Just, reasoned, efficient, and innovative resolution of matters in a manner that ensures integrity, due process and transparency, and respects the dignity of all participants.*

**From:** Stephen D. Lee [<mailto:SLee@rwglaw.com>]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 15, 2016 5:36 PM  
**To:** Yacknin, Hallie  
**Cc:** B. Tilden Kim  
**Subject:** RE: A.15-04-013 -- Request to File Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss

Dear Judge Yacknin,

My firm represents the City of Jurupa Valley ("Jurupa Valley") *In the Matter of the Application of SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for the RTRP Transmission Project (U 338-E) (A.15-04-013)*. Pursuant to CPUC Rules of Practice and Procedure, rule 11.1(f), I am writing to request your permission to file replies to the responses to Jurupa Valley's Motion to Dismiss.

Jurupa Valley filed a Motion to Dismiss Southern California Edison's ("SCE") application, and on July 13, 2016, SCE and the County of Riverside ("Riverside") filed a joint response to Jurupa Valley's Motion to Dismiss. In addition, on July 14, 2016, the California Independent System Operator Corporation ("CAISO") served a motion for party status and a response to Jurupa Valley's Motion to Dismiss.

In order to respond to the issues raised in the responses and provide further clarity to the Commission, Jurupa Valley seeks permission to file replies to both the joint response prepared by SCE and Riverside and the response prepared by

CAISO. Although Jurupa Valley does not presume whether CAISO's motion for party status will be granted or denied, in an abundance of caution, Jurupa Valley seeks permission to file a reply to the CAISO response as well.

I understand that CPUC Rules of Practice and Procedure, rule 8.3 *et seq.* governs ex parte communications. Because the instant request to file replies to the responses is procedural in nature, it is my understanding that this procedural request does not fall within the definition of an ex parte communication under CPUC Rules of Practice and Procedure, rule 8.3. If that does not meet with your understanding, Jurupa Valley would be happy to provide notice and reporting of this correspondence.

Best Regards,  
Stephen Lee

Richards | Watson | Gershon  
355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3101  
T 213.626.8484 | F 213.626.0078  
[slee@rwglaw.com](mailto:slee@rwglaw.com)

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.